[1st February 1929

(b) The Government are not aware that this is so.

(c) The Government have not received any recommendations. The orders of Government are not required for granting remission of the second crop charge on single crop wet land in cases when the second crop has failed.

Execution of kudimaramat works.

*1378 Q.—Mr. A. Parasurama Rao: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether there are any records to show that a particular work comes under the category of kudimaramat works;

(b) whether any investigation was made at the time of settlement that a particular work must be maintained by customary labour;

(c) whether the fixing of the rate of assessment has anything to do with the contribution of labour by the ryots for such works;

(d) if so, what percentage was deducted for such a contribution of labour by the ryots;

(e) whether it is entirely left to the Public Works Department authorities or the Revenue authorities to decide whether a particular work is to be maintained by customary labour or otherwise;

(f) whether any co-operative societies have been formed for the execution of kudimaramat works, and if so, how many and when;

(g) whether it is a fact that the Settlement Officers take into consideration the labour of the ryot in lifting water for irrigation of his lands and whether a remission of 25 per cent is allowed in such cases;

(h) whether it is a fact that a similar remission of 25 per cent in the assessment is made in the case of dasabandham works;

(i) whether no such consideration was shown in the case of kudimaramat works;

(j) if so, whether the Government will now at least make such concession;

(k) whether the removal of prickly-pear growth is one of the items included in the kudimaramat works, and under what authority;

(l) whether any register of the kind referred to in G.O. Mis. No. 2463, Revenue, dated 30th November 1927, was maintained before the said Government Order was passed; and

(m) if so, whether the hon. Member will be pleased to place it on the table of the House?

A.—(a), (b) & (k) The hon. Member is referred to the answer to clauses (a) to (c) of question No. 602 answered on 12th October 1928.

(c) & (d) The answer is in the negative.

(e) The Public Works Department authorities have no voice in the matter. If by local custom any work is usually executed by the joint labour of a village community and if the community fails or neglects to execute the work, the Revenue officers enforce the provisions of section 6 of Madras Act I of 1858.

(f) Yes. There were eight societies on 30th June 1928. Two of them were registered in 1923, four in 1924, one in 1927 and one in 1928.

1st February 1929]

(g) The hon. Member is referred to clauses (b) and (c) of the answer to question No. 921 answered on 29th November 1928.

(h) to (j) The questions are not understood.

(l) & (m) No register is referred to in G.O. No. 2463, Revenue, dated 30th November 1927.

Deduction for baling water in the Godavari and Kistna deltas.

*1379 Q.—Mr. C. Ramasomayajulu: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state with reference to the answer given to clauses (b) and (c) of question No. 921 answered on 29th November 1928—

(a) when the deduction for baling water in the delta taluks and in the upland irrigation and Lanka cultivation in the Godavari and Kistna deltas began to be made;

(b) on what basis the deduction rate was fixed; and

(c) whether the deduction rate has been constant throughout or modified at any time and if so, when and on what considerations?

A.—(a) In the year 1861.

(b) It was based on rough calculations of a Settlement officer Mr. Master.

(c) The proportion (one-fourth) of the water-rate has not varied.

Mr. C. Ramasomayajulu:—"May I know, with reference to clause (b), whether the cost involved in baling has any reference to the rate fixed?"

The hon. Sir Norman Marjoribanks:—"I have stated that the proposal was based on Mr. Master's report."

Mr. C. Ramasomayajulu:—"May I know whether calculations were made with reference to the cost of baling?"

The hon. Sir Norman Marjoribanks:—"The calculations of Mr. Master were made in 1861."

Public Service

Orders passed on the report of the Committee on the communal Government Orders.

*1380 Q.—Mr. C. S. Govindaraja Mudaliyar: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether orders were passed on the report of the Committee appointed by the Government in the year 1926 on the question of giving effect to the communal Government Orders passed by the Government;

(b) whether a copy of the report and the orders passed thereon will be placed on the table of the House; and

(c) whether effect was given to the recommendations of the Committee of which the present Law Member was the Chairman?

A.—(a) to (c) The Committee in question made no report.